## 2005-2006 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

## U.S. Department of Education

| Cover Sheet Type of Sc   | hool: (Check all that appl                    | y) Elementa           | ry Middle           | X_ High _     | _ K-12Charter    |
|--|---|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Name of Principal:   | Mr. Jeffrey J. Him                            | <u>man</u>            |                     |               |                  |
| Official School Name:  | Tremont High Scl                              | <u>nool</u>           |                     |               |                  |
| School Mailing Address:  | 400 W. Pearl Tremont, IL.                     | 61568-850             | <u>0</u>            |               |                  |
| County: <u>Tazewell</u>  | State School Cod                              | le Number* <u>5</u>   | <u>3-090-7020-2</u> | <u>6-0001</u> |                  |
| Telephone (309) 925-3823                                       |   | _Fax: <u>(309) 9</u>  | 925-5817            |               |                  |
| Website/URL_www.tremont?                                       | '02.us  | _ E-mail: <u>jhin</u> | ıman@roe53.k        | :12.il.us     |                  |
| I have reviewed the informat certify that to the best of my k  | 2.2   | _                     |                     | requirements  | s on page 2, and |
|  |   |                       | Date                |               |                  |
| (Principal's Signature)  |   |                       |                     |               |                  |
| Name of Superintendent* Mr.                                    | Donald Beard<br>(Specify: Ms., Miss, M        | rs., Dr., Mr., Other  | )                   |               |                  |
| District Name: <u>Tre</u>                                      | mont Unit School D                            | istrict #702          | Tel.(309) 92        | 25-3461       |                  |
| I have reviewed the informat certify that to the best of my k  |   |                       | the eligibility     | requirements  | s on page 2, and |
|  |   |                       | _ Date              |               |                  |
| (Superintendent's Signature)                                   |   |                       |                     |               |                  |
| Name of School Board Presid                                    | ent: Mr. Michael Pf<br>(Specify: Ms., Miss, M |                       | er)                 |               |                  |
| I have reviewed the informate certify that to the best of my k |   |                       | he eligibility      | requirements  | on page 2, and   |
|  |   |                       | Date                |               |                  |
| (School Board President's/Chair                                | person's Signature)                           |                       |                     |               |                  |
| *Private Schools: If the information                           | requested is not applica                      | ble. write N/A in     | the space.          |               |                  |

2005-2006 Application Page 1 of 16

#### **PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION**

#### [Include this page in the school's application as page 2.]

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

- 1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2005-2006 school year.
- 3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
- 4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2000 and has not received the 2003, 2004, or 2005 *No Child Left Behind Blue Ribbon Schools Award.*
- 5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

#### PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

**DISTRICT** (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

| 1. | Number of schools in the district:   |   |
|----|--|---|
|    |  | _3_ TOTAL   |
| 2. | District Per Pupil Expenditure:  | <u>\$6,762</u>  |
|    | Average State Per Pupil Expenditure:   | <u>\$8,786</u>  |
|    | HOOL (To be completed by all schools)  |   |
| 3. | Category that best describes the area w  | here the school is located:                                     |
|    | <ul> <li>Urban or large central city</li> <li>Suburban school with character</li> <li>Suburban</li> <li>Small city or town in a rural and Rural</li> </ul> | eristics typical of an urban area                               |
| 4. | 6 Number of years the principa   | l has been in her/his position at this school.                  |
|    | If fewer than three years, how   | long was the previous principal at this school?                 |
| 5. | Number of students as of October 1 en  | rolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school |

| Grade                                   | # of<br>Males | # of<br>Females | Grade<br>Total | Grade | # of<br>Males | # of<br>Females | Grade<br>Total |
|---|---------------|-----------------|----------------|-------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| PreK                                    |               |                 |                | 7     |               |                 |                |
| K                                       |               |                 |                | 8     |               |                 |                |
| 1                                       |               |                 |                | 9     | 44            | 31              | 75             |
| 2                                       |               |                 |                | 10    | 43            | 57              | 100            |
| 3                                       |               |                 |                | 11    | 37            | 32              | 69             |
| 4                                       |               |                 |                | 12    | 52            | 34              | 86             |
| 5                                       |               |                 |                | Other |               |                 |                |
| 6                                       |               |                 |                |       |               |                 |                |
| TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL → |               |                 |                |       |               |                 |                |

only:

#### [Throughout the document, round numbers to avoid decimals.]

| 6. | Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:       | 99.7 % White0.3 % Black or Africa% Hispanic or La% Asian/Pacific I% American India% Total            | tino                  |                     |
|----|--|--|-----------------------|---------------------|
|    | Use only the five standard categories                          | es in reporting the racial/eth   | nic composition of t  | the school.         |
| 7. | Student turnover, or mobility rate,                            | during the past year: 5.5%   |                       |                     |
|    | [This rate should be calculated using                          | ng the grid below. The answ  | er to (6) is the mobi | lity rate.]         |
|    | (1)  | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.   | 8                     |                     |
|    | (2)  | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 11                    |                     |
|    | (3)  | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]  | 19                    |                     |
|    | (4)  | Total number of students in the school as of October 1   | 351                   |                     |
|    | (5)  | Total transferred<br>students in row (3)<br>divided by total students<br>in row (4)                  | .0541                 |                     |
|    | (6)  | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100  | 5.5                   |                     |
| 8. | Limited English Proficient student                             | ——————————————————————————————————————   | tal Number Limited    | l English Proficien |
|    | Number of languages represented:<br>Specify languages: English | 1  |                       |                     |
| 9. | Students eligible for free/reduced-                            | priced meals: 4.6_%  |                       |                     |

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

\_16\_

Total number students who qualify:

| 10. | tudents receiving special education services: 9 % 35 Total Number of Students Served  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|     |   | ow the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories. |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11  | Hearing ImpairmentMental RetardationMultiple Disabilities   | Visual Impairment Including Blindness s  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. | Indicate number of full-time and part-time s  | Number of  | · ·   |  |  |  |  |  |
|     |   | Full-time  | Part-Time   |  |  |  |  |  |
|     | Administrator(s)  | 2  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|     | Classroom teachers  | 23   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|     | Special resource teachers/specialists   | 2  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|     | Paraprofessionals   | 3  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|     | Support staff   | 2  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|     | Total number  | 32   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. | Average school student-"classroom teacher' students in the school divided by the FTE of   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. | Show the attendance patterns of teachers and defined by the state. The student drop-off rastudents and the number of exiting students the number of exiting students from the number of the number of exiting students. | ate is the difference befrom the same cohor  | between the number of entering t. (From the same cohort, subtract |  |  |  |  |  |

|                                     | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance            | 96%       | 96.4%     | 96.1%     | 96.7%     | 96.3%     |
| Daily teacher attendance            | 97.47%    | 97.75%    | 98.28%    | 96.70%    | 97.25%    |
| Teacher turnover rate               | 0.4%      | 0.4%      | 0.9%      | 0.0%      | 0.4%      |
| Student dropout rate (middle/high)  | 0.6%      | 1%        | 0.6%      | 1.6%      | 1.3%      |
| Student drop-off rate (high school) | 6.17%     | 8.75%     | 11.49%    | 4.0%      | 16.88%    |

number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off

rates.

14. (*High Schools Only*) Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2005 are doing as of September 2005.

| Graduating class size                      | 76_            |
|--|----------------|
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | <u>_19.7</u> % |
| Enrolled in a community college            | <u>51.3</u> %  |
| Enrolled in vocational training            | %              |
| Found employment                           | <u>_23.6</u> % |
| Military service                           | <u>5.4</u> %   |
| Other (travel, staying home, etc.)         | %              |
| Unknown                                    | %              |
| Total                                      | 100 %          |

#### **PART III - SUMMARY**

Provide a brief, coherent narrative snapshot of the school in one page (approximately 600 words). Include at least a summary of the school's mission or vision in the statement.

Tremont High School's motto – "A Tradition of Educational Excellence" captures the spirit of this rural high school of 300 students. Since 1857 Tremont High School has been the heart and soul of a community that prides itself on the school's academic excellence

In the early 1990's Tremont High School went through a major restructuring not only to maintain its high standards but also to give students the skills they would need to face the 21st century. A team of administrators, teachers, business leaders, students, and parents developed a mission statement that we continue to strive for: We will know that Tremont High School is successful when it is a meaningful place for all of our students. In addition, ten key exit goals for graduating seniors were established. They include:

- Demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills
- Use critical thinking to solve problems, make judgments, and integrate learning
- Develop self-esteem by becoming motivated to achieve their individual potential
- Demonstrate proficiency in the basic skills by applying them to real life situations
- Are responsible and involved citizens with high ethical standards
- Are self-directed achievers who have learned how to learn
- Use technology to solve problems and achieve goals
- Appreciated the world and its diverse cultures
- Understand the importance of good physical and mental health
- Demonstrate the ability to work cooperatively with others

Tremont High School's goals go far beyond the basic core curriculum. In order to provide global, technical, and fine arts goals within the framework of a small school with limited resources, the school adopted the 8-block schedule giving students 8 different 85-minute classes over a two-day period. As a result, Tremont students need 27 credits to graduate, more than any school in Central Illinois. However, our students are far from bored. Rather they have an opportunity to in-depth hands on learning. A tour of our school would find about 1/3 of our students in band or chorus, a thriving art department, 3 state of the art computer labs, a desk-top video lab, a multi-media learning center staffed by parent volunteers, students taking junior college classes for dual credit, student taking internet virtual high school classes in subjects from Latin to Animal Science, and students wearing heart monitors as they reach their goals in Personal Fitness. A visitor would also see some students leaving the building at noon to earn on

the job training through the school's Coop Program. A visit to core classrooms would find mixed ability classrooms with a rich, challenging curriculum. Special needs students go in and out of a technology laden and lively Resource Room staffed by two full-time special education teachers and several aides. Additionally, the Resource staff has a constant presence in the regular classrooms as they facilitate a strong inclusion program.

The doors of Tremont High School remain open long after the last bell rings at 3:00. In spite of its small size, the school has all major athletic teams. Extra pride currently surrounds the school's cross-country team as they earned a third place trophy in the state meet this past fall. Students also compete in Speech, Reader's Theatre, and Scholastic Bowl. Each year the fine arts department performs a major play or musical, and the Madrigal Singers, and Jazz Band give performances throughout the area.

Even with all these activities within the school walls, Tremont High School's educational goals reach into the community. All students must complete 40 hours of community service over four years of high school, but most students do much more than the minimum requirement. The school has a very active Student Council that has raised over \$5000 each of the past three years to sponsor a child for the Make-A-Wish Foundation. This year the students decided to divert money from their Homecoming decorations and floats to the Katrina Relief effort and for the past two years the Senior Class has worked on a student generated project with Habitat for Humanity.

Yet none of these activities really speak to the crucial ingredient that makes Tremont High School a meaningful place to be - the glue that holds it all together is definitely the bond among administrators, teachers, support staff, and students. The adults and students at Tremont High School truly like, respect, and care about each other.

#### PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results: Describe in one page the meaning of the school's assessment results in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics in such a way that someone not intimately familiar with the tests can easily understand them. Explain disparities among subgroups. If the school participates in the state assessment system, briefly explain the state performance levels and the performance level that demonstrates meeting the standard. Provide the website where information on the state assessment system may be found.

Recently identified as one of the top 50 high schools in the state of Illinois by the Chicago Sun Times, Tremont High School continues to perform well on state tests. The Illinois State Standards provide a rigorous measure by which student performance can be assessed. More importantly, the standards promote integrated learning and critical thinking that going beyond the traditional measures of achievement.

While Tremont students generally perform exceptionally well on these measures, the class of 2006 improved significantly in reading, math, and science. The cumulative ACT results – given to all students in Illinois demonstrated the highest level of performance in the five years the test has been given to all. Tremont students are nearly two points higher on their composites than the state average on the ACT.

Sub-groups at Tremont are so small that they are not measured against AYP. That said, we continue to monitor individual student performance for all IEP students. Our attempts to track individuals evolved from a desire to improve reading and math instructional strategies for these students and maintain the most proper educational plan congruent with the child's disability. Other sub-groups we have monitored over the last several years include those students economically disadvantaged and gender.

## 2. Using Assessment Results: Show in one-half page (approximately 300 words) how the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.

In a small school, reviewers must exercise caution when comparing scores from year to year. Several variables can impact the relatively small sample and extreme yearly changes in data can occur. Taking that phenomenon into account, we have still been concerned with a five-year decline in reading. Because of this trend, the school initiated a reading focus as part of the school improvement plan prior to the last school term. Specifically, all teachers participated in study groups (facilitated by our Language Arts Department) that focused on Chris Tovani's <u>Do I Really Have To Teach Reading?</u>. After a series of discussions in small groups, teachers experimented with various content reading strategies and reported their results back to the small group. A facilitator from the local Regional Office of Education presented at the last teacher's meeting to bridge the gaps between small groups and actual practice. We found the exercise to be extremely beneficial. Other school improvement initiatives centered around reading including the creation of test items that promoted technical reading, departmental goals focused on literacy, and the administration of a sample state reading tests to all teachers.

We've been pleased with the results our focus on reading has generated and remain hopeful that the trends continue. Our staff continues to need training in the use of technical reading in the content areas as well as their role to promote and teach reading strategies. Because of the groundwork laid, we believe our staff is more willing to experiment with reading strategies and their role as a reading facilitator.

## 3. Communicating Assessment Results: Describe in one-half page how the school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community.

Each year, the district's administration presents an expansive annual report to the Board of Education. The report lists all aspects of the District's health but focuses on student achievement as the most important component. The annual report provides an opportunity to promote the positive news demonstrated by our student's performance in a public forum. Members of the instructional staff, parents, students, and other interested community members attend the presentation.

In addition, building principals conduct public forums in each building to present student performance data. This provides an outstanding opportunity to hear from parents their reactions to the achievement level of our students and listen to the practical issues this raises for them on a daily basis.

Our teachers are presented this information annually. Usually it occurs during the opening workshops prior to the start of the year. We are in the process of determining ways the data can be broken down more effectively by individual. With the help of current state initiatives, we believe we'll do a better job of tracking individual student performance – even if they change schools.

## 4. Sharing Success: Describe in one-half page how the school has shared and will continue to share its successes with other schools.

The District has a history of presenting information to administrators and teachers in other districts. A few years ago, district administrators presented our professional growth plan to area administrators as part of the Administrative Academy requirement for Illinois principals. If our reading numbers persist, we are considering the development of a workshop or seminar on the approach we took to increase reading scores in the building.

#### PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum: Describe in one page the school's curriculum. Outline in several sentences the core of each curriculum area and show how all students are engaged with significant content based on high standards. Include art and foreign languages in the descriptions. (Foreign language instruction as a part of the core curriculum is an eligibility requirement in grades 7 and higher and must be taught as a whole-year subject.)

Students at Tremont High School have the opportunity to take a large number of classes covering a comprehensive curriculum. For a small rural school, we're extremely proud of the course offerings we have in the community. Beyond what is offered by the professional staff at Tremont, students may be exposed to additional classes through the Illinois Virtual High School online or distance learning options provided by Illinois Central College.

English I through English IV is offered to students. Seniors have the option to take a placement exam for dual credit through the local community college. Tremont High School instructors as adjuncts through ICC currently teach classes in British Literature and English Composition.

Spanish is our only foreign language taught by Tremont High School instructors. Four levels are offered and seniors have the option of taking Spanish IV for college credit. Additional foreign language options are available online through the Illinois Virtual High School.

Science courses include Fundamentals of Biology, Biology I, Environmental Science, Chemistry, Biology II, and Physics. Three years of science is required at Tremont. Varying ability levels are channeled into the appropriate courses but all tend to be based on scientific inquiry with a number of labs designed to engage students.

Social science courses include geography, world history, recent U.S. history, government, resource management, economics, and sociology. Four years are required and the senior electives are economics and sociology. The department has taken an active role in identifying differentiated methods of instruction designed to congruently address the state standards.

The math department juggles the wide discrepancy in student ability by offering a number of course offerings beginning with pre-algebra. Algebra I, basic geometry, geometry, Algebra II, FST (Functions/statistics/trigonometry), and Pre-Calc round out the course offerings here. Students have the option to take more advanced courses online. Beginning next year, college level credit will be offered to our students. We have recently increased the minimum math requirements to three years but are strongly encouraging parents and students to plan their course selections as if they will be enrolled in four years of math.

The Fine Arts program at THS is outstanding. A large band, chorus, and art contingent make-up the selections here. Over 1/3 of all students are enrolled in each program. Several local and state awards have accompanied these courses. The most telling evidence of their success is the number of students involved and the quality of each presentation or performance.

Vocational course offerings include traditional family and consumer science course offerings in foods, parenting, interior design, and foods II. In Industrial Technology, Manufacturing I and II, Transportation Technology, Energy Technology, Transportation Systems I and II, Computer Aided Design, and Communications are offered. Additionally, an outstanding Cooperative Education Program helps bridge the gap between real-world applications and school. Student placement has included Caterpillar Tractor Company, nursing homes, veterinary clinics, day care for children, etc.

The technology and business department has worked hard to stay current and provide a fluent program that has changed dramatically over the years. No longer content to offer keyboarding and computer applications (those former requirements have now made their way to the middle school) course offerings include Website Design I and II, Marketing, Business Management, Accounting I and II, Multi-

media, Desktop Video, Networking I and II, and Business Computing Systems. State of the art facilities and equipment provide outstanding opportunities for our students. A comprehensive intern program in networking, web design, and web information are among the multitude of additional opportunities for students at Tremont in technology.

Finally, the most impressive component of the physical education department is their abandonment of traditional methodologies. While physical education is still included as part of the class schedule, more and more students are choosing to participate in Personal Fitness or Weight Training to earn their p.e. requirements (still four years in Illinois). Given the recent focus on childhood obesity, we believe these courses are more beneficial for the life-long commitment to overall wellness.

- 2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading: Describe in one-half page the school's reading curriculum, including a description of why the school chose this particular approach to reading.
- 2b. (Secondary Schools) English: Describe in one-half page the school's English language curriculum, including efforts the school makes to improve the reading skills of students who read below grade level.

Reading is at the core of the English curriculum at Tremont High School. The high school English department meets regularly with the middle school language arts teachers to articulate the curriculum. Students who do not meet or exceed Illinois state reading standards are analyzed with both high school and middle school staff so that students' needs can be targeted at the early high school level.

The first three years of required English are taught in mixed ability classrooms that use differentiated instruction to meet all students' needs. Standards and expectations are high, but students who have reading differences are assisted by the resource staff in an IEP is involved, by a study skills teacher in a supervised study period, or by a special tutor funded by a local community college. This support system encourages students to interact with peers in a full inclusion setting. 11<sup>th</sup> graders are offered reading coaching during homeroom time and through an evening course from the local community college to prepare for the ACT and Prairie State tests. Additionally, the school's one semester required speech course was redesigned this year as Communications I with an emphasis on specific reading strategies used within the framework nonfiction research for oral multi-media presentations. In 11<sup>th</sup> grade students take the English placement test from the local community college. Students who score at the college entrance level are given a dual credit literature and composition courses earning 6 hours of college credit during their senior year. Students who do not yet place at the college level take a skills based integrated course preparing them for the placement test at the end of their senior year.

To expand reading throughout the content areas, the language arts staff serves as facilitators for content area teachers in study groups focused on reading strategies for secondary students. This approach has resulted in positive reading growth at the high school level and beyond.

3. Mathematics, Science, Art, Etc.: Describe in one-half page one other curriculum area of the school's choice and show how it relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school's mission.

The mathematics curriculum at Tremont High School offers students of all abilities many options. Our students have a seamless transition from middle school to high school due in part to our 6-12 aligned math curriculum. As 8<sup>th</sup> graders, students have the opportunity to complete a freshmen level algebra class that allows them to enter high school and begin geometry. Most other students begin high school with either algebra or pre-algebra. All students can complete four math courses, some choosing to complete 2 courses in one year, and possibly a 5<sup>th</sup> course of pre-calculus or a calculus course

online or at the local community college. We require students to complete three years of math for graduation and a large percentage complete four years. We are looking into offering dual-credit courses from our local community college so that students could complete college credits while still in high school.

4. **Instructional Methods:** Describe in one-half page the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.

The professional staff at Tremont High School incorporates a wide variety of instructional methods. Differentiated practice and integrated instruction are used whenever possible. During the curriculum mapping initiative two years ago, gaps in our approach to the performance descriptors under each standard were identified. From there, we found the most appropriate areas in which to address. Instructional strategies were incorporated as part of initiatives within each department — particularly in the area of reading.

Professional growth plans for individual teachers have been filed in the areas of group instruction, authentic assessment, the use of technology, questioning strategies, and standards based projects. When the growth plans were utilized, teachers would identify specific practices or other areas related to student achievement they wanted to research. Their practice would be impacted by the gathering of knowledge in a particular area and then shared within the professional community.

5. **Professional Development:** Describe in one-half page the school's professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement.

District #702 practices a collaborative approach to professional development. Prior to the 2003-04 school year, individual teachers were empowered to determine their own professional growth. Each instructor created and implemented a professional growth plan that identified an area the practitioner wanted to explore. Provisions were made for feedback to the entire professional community and group projects were encouraged. Multiple topics were examined. The district's philosophy was that individual growth was congruent with organizational growth.

For the past three years, the administration worked with various leadership teams in the three buildings to develop professional development goals in curriculum mapping, reading, assessment, and student services. The collaborative approach has served the district well – especially in determining specific goals and timelines for each initiative.

The curriculum maps have encouraged the alignment and integration of the K-12 curriculum both horizontally and vertically. We'll continue to use the data as we gather more information on curricular gaps comparative to the state standards. They also serve as a wonderful tool to provide to new teachers or parents as a snapshot of the course curriculum

As noted earlier, reading scores have improved at Tremont High School. Based on conversations with the language arts department, a resource was identified (Chris Tovani's book <u>Do I Really Have to Teach Reading?</u>) and study groups were formed. The language arts department served as facilitators to this initiative. We brought in a local expert from the Regional Office of Education to present at the year's final workshop.

The assessment and student services initiatives will proceed during the next two school years. The school improvement team has established timelines and goals and we are currently searching for a resource to use in small groups.

#### PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

#### **Public Schools**

Each nominated school must show comparable results in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics for at least the last three years according to the criteria used by the CSSO to nominate the school. The school must show results beyond the first grade in the school. For example, ninth grade test results are not sufficient for 9-12 high schools. For formatting, if possible use or adapt the sample tables (no charts or graphs) at the end of this application.

If the state allows the use of the PSAT, PLAN, SAT, or ACT as part of its accountability system and at least 90 percent of the students in the appropriate classes must take the tests, schools must report the results. For these tests, schools must use national norms. The national school norms for the 90th and 60th percentiles can be found on the Department's website. If fewer than 90 percent of the students take a combination of the tests, that is, the ACT and the SAT or the PLAN and the PSAT, do not report the data.

The school must disaggregate all data for socioeconomic and ethnic/racial groups that comprise sufficient numbers to be a part of the state's assessment reports or are of sufficient numbers to be statistically significant. Show how all subgroups of students achieved at high levels or improved dramatically in achievement for at least three years. Explain any disparity among subgroups. The school must specify the number and percentage of students assessed by alternative methods.

All test data tables should be attached to the end of the application, with all pages numbered consecutively.

#### Tremont High School – Summary of Average ACT Scores for the Total Group:

| Local    | Number  | English | Math | Reading | Science | Composite |
|----------|---------|---------|------|---------|---------|-----------|
| 2000-01  | 54      | 22.5    | 22.5 | 24.5    | 23.1    | 23.3      |
| 2001-02  | 73      | 20.7    | 22.4 | 21.5    | 21.7    | 21.7      |
| 2002-03  | 72      | 20.5    | 21.2 | 21.4    | 21.4    | 21.2      |
| 2003-04  | 64      | 22.0    | 21.4 | 22.3    | 21.2    | 21.9      |
| 2004-05  | 73      | 22.7    | 21.6 | 21.3    | 21.7    | 21.9      |
| State    |         |         |      |         |         |           |
| 2000-01  | 89311   | 21.1    | 21.5 | 21.8    | 21.6    | 21.6      |
| 2001-02  | 128753  | 19.4    | 20.2 | 20.3    | 20.0    | 20.1      |
| 2002-03  | 134505  | 19.6    | 20.2 | 20.4    | 20.1    | 20.2      |
| 2003-04  | 132525  | 19.7    | 20.2 | 20.5    | 20.2    | 20.3      |
| 2004-05  | 135967  | 19.9    | 20.2 | 20.3    | 20.4    | 20.3      |
| National |         |         |      |         |         |           |
| 2000-01  | 1069772 | 20.5    | 20.7 | 21.3    | 21.0    | 21.0      |
| 2001-02  | 1116082 | 20.2    | 20.6 | 21.1    | 20.8    | 20.8      |
| 2002-03  | 1175059 | 20.3    | 20.6 | 21.2    | 20.8    | 20.8      |
| 2003-04  | 1171460 | 20.4    | 20.7 | 21.3    | 20.9    | 20.9      |
| 2004-05  | 1186251 | 20.4    | 20.7 | 21.3    | 20.9    | 20.9      |

#### SAMPLE FORMAT FOR STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

| [Sample Data Display Table for Reading (la. | nguage ar | ts or Eng | lish) and | Mathem    | atics]    |   |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|
| Subject Grade Te                            | est       |           |           |           |           |   |
| Edition/Publication Year Publishe           | r         |           |           |           |           |   |
|   | _         | _         | _         | _         | T         | • |
| TT C 4                                      | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | I |
| Testing month                               |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| SCHOOL SCORES*                              |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| % At or Above Meets State Standards*        |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| % At Exceeds State Standards*               |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| Number of students tested                   |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| Percent of total students tested            |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| Number of students alternatively assessed   |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed  |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| •   |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                             |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| 1. (specify subgroup)                       |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| % At or Above Meets State Standards         |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| % At Exceeds State Standards                |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| Number of students tested                   |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| 2. (specify subgroup)                       |           |           |           |           |           | I |
| % At or Above Meets State Standards         |           |           |           |           |           | l |
| % At Exceeds State Standards                |           |           |           |           |           | 1 |
| Number of students tested                   | 1         |           |           |           |           | 1 |
| runiosi oi studento testod                  | 1         |           |           |           |           | 1 |

#### \*Change the sample table categories to use the state assessment system's categories and terminology.

Provide information in a table similar to the one above for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate table for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade. Explain any alternative assessments. See the sample table on page 4.

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state, for example, 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. If the state does not report scores using the categories of basic, proficient, and advanced, use the state's categories and report data for all levels. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should be cumulative and include students scoring at or above the "meets state standard" level. For example, 91% are "at or above meets state standards" and 42% are "at exceeds state standards."

Use the same basic format for subgroup results. Complete a separate form for each test and each grade level. Present at least three years of comparable data to show decreasing disparity among subgroups. Some subgroup examples are: (a) Socioeconomic Status [e.g., eligible for free and reduced-priced meals, not eligible for free and reduced-priced meals]; (b) Ethnicity [e.g., White, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan Native]; (c) Students with Disabilities.

# SAMPLE FORMAT FOR DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

[Sample Data Display Table for Reading (language arts or English) and Mathematics]

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate table for each test and grade level, and place it on a separate page. Explain any alternative assessments.

| Subject Grade Test                              |             |           |           |           |           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Edition/Publication Year Publisher              |             |           |           |           |           |
| Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs S | caled score | es Per    | centiles  |           |           |
|   |             |           |           |           |           |
| Testing month                                   | 2004-2005   | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 |

|  | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month                              |           |           |           |           |           |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |           |           |           |           |           |
| Total Score                                |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of total students tested           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed |           |           |           |           |           |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |           |           |           |           |           |
| 1(specify subgroup)                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| 2(specify subgroup)                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| 3(specify subgroup)                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| 4(specify subgroup)                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |           |           |           |           |           |

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

|                             | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| NATIONAL MEAN SCORE         |           |           |           |           |           |
| NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION |           |           |           |           |           |

# **Tremont High School PSAE/ACT Results – Cumulative**

|                         |                              | Warning                | Below                    | Meets                     | Exceeds                 | Total Mts/Ex             |  |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Reading:                |                              |                        |                          |                           |                         |                          |  |
|                         | 2001                         | 4% (8%)                | 18%(34%)                 | 59%(46%)                  | 18%(12%)                | 77% (58%)                |  |
|                         | 2002                         | 7% (8%)                | 29% (34%)                | 48% (45%)                 | 16% (13%)               | 64% (58%)                |  |
|                         | 2003                         | 5.6% (7.5)             | 26.8% (36.1)             | 52.1% (44.8)              | 15.5% (11.6)            | 67.6% (56.4)             |  |
|                         | 2004                         | 6.5% (8.2)             | 22.1% (35.0)             | 58.4% (46.8)              | 13.0% (10.0)            | 71.4% (56.8%)            |  |
|                         | 2005                         | 1.2% (7.9%)            | 21.7% (32.6%)            | 62.7% (46.4%)             | 16.9% (13.1%)           | 79.6% (59.5%)            |  |
| Math                    | emati                        |                        |                          |                           |                         |                          |  |
|                         | 2001                         | 3% (9%)                | 18%(37%)                 | 62%(45%)                  | 17%(9%)                 | 79% (54%)                |  |
|                         | 2002                         | 11% (10%)              | 26% (36%)                | 56% (45%)                 | 7% (8%)                 | 63% (53%)                |  |
|                         | 2003                         | 4.2%(9.5)              | 23.9%(37.2)              | 66.2%(46.6)               | 5.6% (6.7)              | 71.8% (53.3)             |  |
|                         | 2004                         | 3.9% (9.7)             | 23.4% (37.1)             | 63.6% (42.8)              | 9.1% (10.3)             | 72.7% (53.1%)            |  |
|                         | 2005                         | 2.4% (9.8%)            | 22.9% (37.4%)            | 72.3% (45.6%)             | 2.4% (7.2%)             | 74.7% (52.8%)            |  |
| Writi                   | _                            |                        |                          |                           |                         |                          |  |
|                         | 2001                         | 0% (6%)                | 25%(35%)                 | 61%(50%)                  | 14%(9%)                 | 75% (59%)                |  |
|                         | 2002                         | 5% (6%)                | 32% (34%)                | 58% (49%)                 | 5% (10%)                | 62% (59%)                |  |
|                         | 2003                         | 4.2%(9.5)              | 16.9%(37.2)              | 60.6%(46.6)               | 18.3%(9.4)              | 78.9%(58.9%)             |  |
|                         | 2004<br>2005                 | 1.3% (7.3)             | 19.5% (33.1)             | 55.8% (47.7)              | 23.4% (11.9%)           | 79.2% (59.6%)            |  |
| Caian                   |                              | No Test                |                          |                           |                         |                          |  |
| Scien                   |                              | 40/ (120/)             | 200/ (200/ )             | E10/ (200/ )              | 170//110/)              | COO/ (FOO/)              |  |
|                         | 2001<br>2002                 | 4% (12%)               | 28%(38%)                 | 51%(39%)                  | 17%(11%)                | 68% (50%)                |  |
|                         | 2002                         | 6% (11%)<br>1.4%(10.7) | 30% (37%)<br>36.6%(38.0) | 51% (41%)<br>56.3% (40.0) | 12% (12%)<br>5.6%(11.3) | 63% (53%)<br>61.9%(51.3) |  |
|                         | 2003                         | 2.6% (10.6)            | 32.5% (36.5)             | 51.9% (41.0)              | 13.0% (11.9)            | 64.9% (52.9)             |  |
|                         | 2005                         | 2.4% (10.2%)           |                          |                           |                         | 75.9% (52.5%)            |  |
| Socia                   | al Sciel                     | , ,                    | 21.770 (37.370)          | 7 00.2 70 (11.170)        | 13.7 70 (11.1 70)       | 73.570 (32.570)          |  |
| Docia                   | 2001                         | 6% (9%)                | 17%(33%)                 | 55%(43%)                  | 23%(15%)                | 78% (58%)                |  |
|                         | 2002                         | 2% (7%)                | 38% (36%)                | 46% (43%)                 | 13% (14%)               | 59% (57%)                |  |
|                         | 2003                         | 1.4% (8.0)             | 21.1%(35.8)              | 66.2%(41.7)               | 11.3%(14.5)             | 77.5%(56.2)              |  |
|                         | 2004                         | 1.3% (7.7)             | 24.4% (32.9)             | 60.3% (44.9)              | 14.1% (14.5)            | 74.4% (59.4)             |  |
|                         | 2005                         | No Test                | ( )                      | (1117)                    | ()                      | (22.1)                   |  |
|                         |                              |                        |                          |                           |                         |                          |  |
| Cumulative PSAE Results |                              |                        |                          |                           |                         |                          |  |
| 2001                    | ` ,                          |                        |                          |                           |                         |                          |  |
| 2002                    | 62.2% (56.0) (STATE AVERAGE) |                        |                          |                           |                         |                          |  |
| 2003<br>2004            | 71.5% (55.2)<br>72.5% (56.4) |                        |                          |                           |                         |                          |  |
| 2004<br>2005            |                              | 5 (56.4)<br>5 (54.9)   |                          |                           |                         |                          |  |
| 2003                    | 70.77                        | (34.9)                 |                          |                           |                         |                          |  |

#### ACT: Average ACT Score For All <u>JUNIORS</u> (PSAE Test Day I):

| <u>Year</u> | <u>#</u> | <u>Composite</u> | <b>English</b> | <u>Math</u> | <u>Reading</u> | Sci. Reas.  |
|-------------|----------|------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| 2001        | 71       | 21.4 (19.4)      | 20.6 (18.5)    | 22.5 (19.8) | 21.3 (19.5)    | 21.1 (19.5) |
| 2002        | 82       | 20.2 (19.5)      | 19.2 (18.8)    | 20.3 (19.7) | 20.3 (19.6)    | 20.6 (19.5) |
| 2003        | 71       | 20.9 (19.4)      | 20.6 (18.7)    | 20.8 (19.5) | 21.2 (19.6)    | 20.9 (19.5) |
| 2004        | 78       | 21.5 (19.8)      | 22.1 (19.1)    | 21.6 (19.9) | 20.5 (19.6)    | 21.5 (19.8) |
| 2005        | 88       | 21.8 (19.9)      | 22.4 (19.4)    | 20.9 (19.8) | 21.8 (19.9)    | 21.7 (19.8) |

# TREMONT HIGH SCHOOL

### STUDENTS WITH IEP: PERFORMANCE ON PSAE

| Reading:    |                      |       |             |            |      |              |  |
|-------------|----------------------|-------|-------------|------------|------|--------------|--|
| <b>YEAR</b> | <u>#</u>             | # AW  | <u># B_</u> | <u># M</u> | # E_ | # <b>N/A</b> |  |
| 2001        | One student with IEP |       |             |            |      |              |  |
| 2002        | 11                   | 5     | 6           | 0          | 0    | 0            |  |
| 2003        | 8                    | 2     | 4           | 2          | 0    | 0            |  |
| 2004        | 6                    | 4     | 1           | 1          | 0    | 0            |  |
| 2005        | 11                   | 0     | 5           | 3          | 0    | 3            |  |
| Math:       |                      |       |             |            |      |              |  |
| 2001        |                      | One s | tudent v    | vith IEP   | •    |              |  |
| 2002        | 11                   | 6     | 5           | 0          | 0    | 0            |  |
| 2003        | 8                    | 3     | 4           | 1          | 0    | 0            |  |
| 2004        | 6                    | 4     | 1           | 1          | 0    | 0            |  |
| 2005        | 11                   | 1     | 6           | 1          | 0    | 3            |  |
| Writing:    |                      |       |             |            |      |              |  |
| 2001        |                      | One s | tudent v    | vith IEP   | •    |              |  |
| 2002        | 11                   | 3     | 7           | 0          | 0    | 1            |  |
| 2003        | 8                    | 2     | 5           | 1          | 0    | 0            |  |
| 2004        | 6                    | 1     | 4           | 1          | 0    | 0            |  |
| 2005        | No Te                | Test  |             |            |      |              |  |
| Science:    |                      |       |             |            |      |              |  |
| 2001        |                      | One s | tudent v    | vith IEP   | •    |              |  |
| 2002        | 11                   | 4     | 7           | 0          | 0    | 0            |  |
| 2003        | 8                    | 1     | 5           | 2          | 0    | 0            |  |
| 2004        | 6                    | 2     | 3           | 0          | 1    | 0            |  |
| 2005        | 11                   | 1     | 5           | 2          | 0    | 3            |  |
|             |                      |       |             |            |      |              |  |
|             | Т                    |       |             |            |      |              |  |

#### AVG. ACT

| 2001 | One s      | student with IE | P          |            |          |
|------|------------|-----------------|------------|------------|----------|
| 2002 | English 11 | Math 14         | Reading 13 | Science 15 | Comp 13  |
| 2003 | English 11 | Math 16         | Reading 16 | Science 18 | Comp 15  |
| 2004 | English 14 | Math 16         | Reading 15 | Science 16 | Comp. 15 |
| 2005 | English 16 | Math 15         | Reading 18 | Science 18 | Comp. 17 |